

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/450,680

Applicant(s)

MARUMO, MITSUJI

Examiner

Steven H. Rao

Art Unit

2814

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Steven H. Rao. (3) _____

(2) Jack. S. Cübert (24,245). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 04 May 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 22-33.

Identification of prior art discussed: AAPR, Drake & Akagawa.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

 (05/04/05)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner explained to AR Cubert that the present arguments faxed on April 26, 2005 are not comensurate with the scope of the claims. It was suggested that if Applicants' want to distinguish over Drake then the claims must recite " walls contact the grounded electromagnetic shield chamber without any intervening elements being present." or the Applicants' should include the complete structure of the electromagnetic shield chamber e.g. include at least claims 25-27 into the independent claims .